

From: [Flynn, Kathryn](#)
To: [Smeraldi, Josh](#)
Subject: RE: call with NJDEP
Date: Friday, June 5, 2020 9:41:45 AM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

Hi Josh, thank you for the update.

I understand their point about Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 and I think EPA has the same concern.

I also see the potential intrusion for pumping without a barrier wall, but I think that only applies to Alternative 6.

Have a good weekend,

Kathryn

Kathryn Flynn

Technical Support Section

Emergency and Remedial Response Division

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

290 Broadway

New York, NY 10007



From: Smeraldi, Josh <Smeraldi.Josh@epa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, June 04, 2020 4:52 PM

To: Flynn, Kathryn <Flynn.Kathryn@epa.gov>

Subject: call with NJDEP

Hi Kathryn,

I wanted to summarize the call really quick. Overall, NJDEP was fairly quiet on the call and didn't really have too many comments or questions on the alternatives. Specifically for groundwater, they mentioned that alternatives 1, 2, and 3 (no action, institution controls, and institutional controls with barrier wall) would not meet their requirements for a class IIa aquifer. I believe we made that point clear to PPG in our comments. They were also concerned about pump and treat alternatives without a barrier wall along the river. There may be river water intrusion for pumps along the river front. Feel free to still call if you want tomorrow (Friday) but like I mentioned they were fairly quiet on the call, so I don't have much feedback beyond what I mentioned above.

Thanks,

Josh

--

Josh Smeraldi, Ph.D. Env. Eng

EPA Region 2 Superfund and Emergency Management Division

212 637 4302